

2/1/85
JRF

First Line

DIA idea

② L.

DCI TALKING POINTS

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON OFF-SITE CONFERENCE

12 FEBRUARY 1985

9:44 Morning

- I appreciate the opportunity to take a few minutes today and share my thoughts on the challenges that we face in our relationships with the current session of Congress.
- I view the upcoming session as doubly challenging because:
 - (1) There are a number of new members of the intelligence oversight committees in both houses that we need to get to know and that we need to familiarize with the workings of the intelligence community, and
 - (2) The pressure to reduce the federal deficit makes it more important than ever for us to describe simply but defend vigorously our FY 1986 budget request.

help them
understand
us
need to
understand
them +
take concern
what makes
them tick
exchange
information
informal

Membership

- In the first area -- the challenge presented by the large turnover in committee membership -- the key is to establish rapport with the new members and their staffs as quickly as possible, making every effort to provide information they need to understand the basics of intelligence and how we do our business. Toward that end, we have a number of efforts under way to meet with the new members, both individually and in groups, and to brief them on the fundamentals of intelligence. For example, the ICS has a "primer" briefing that they are giving to members on the SSCI, and thus far it has been well received. Also, we are meeting with all of the HPSCI for a full morning session later this month, again with the intent of providing basic information (terminology, program missions, etc.).
- Clearly these sessions are useful, but it's unlikely that they alone will be sufficient to bring all new members fully up to speed on this complex business called intelligence. Consequently, we must take special care to tailor our formal budget testimony to the new members, with particular emphasis on simplicity.

Handle via TALENT-
KEYHOLE ChannelsTOP SECRET

[At this point it would be useful if you could share any personal observations on the political environment on the Hill. For example, mention new members that may be particularly supportive, or non-supportive; prospects for the an across-the-board budget freeze; relationship between the arms control negotiations and Congress's support for military (and intelligence) increases; etc.]

Deficit Problem

In the case of the second major challenge -- the federal deficit problem -- we find ourselves asking for an increase in total NFIP funding in FY 1986 [redacted] real growth [redacted] over FY 1985 funding [redacted]

This is a higher rate of growth than Defense is requesting as a whole, and is certainly well in excess of funding that the freeze proposals would permit. Clearly our task in justifying this growth to the Congress is to make the case that demands for foreign intelligence continue to grow and that budgetary growth is essential if we are to meet these challenges responsibly.

Areas of particular emphasis in our FY 1986 request include:

- [redacted]
- Better intelligence processing and analysis to exploit fully these improved collectors and to allow expanded in-depth analysis on both communist and non-communist targets;
- Continued upgrades to our intelligence capabilities against global topics such as terrorism, illicit narcotics trafficking, and Third World crises; [redacted]
- Continued steady improvements in our human source collection and counterintelligence capabilities; and [redacted]
- Better support services to exploit more efficiently our expanded collection and production capabilities. (TS/TK)

The fact is that we have scrubbed our FY 1986 budget request as hard or harder than any in the recent past, and the effects of a lesser budget (certainly at a freeze level) would be devastating. We have made this case in our negotiations with DoD, and now we have to make it on the Hill.

Handle via TALENT-
KEYHOLE Channels

TOP SECRET

- The major difference is that the emphasis in our testimony on the Hill must be on the substantive reasons for the increases we are requesting, not on the technical attributes of complex systems which most members simply will not, and really should not, take the time to understand. Points we want to drive home are:
 - The Soviet target is becoming increasingly complex;
 - Demands for intelligence on non-traditional targets (narcotics, terrorism, technology transfer, etc.) are increasing;
 - The majority of the budget is to sustain funding for past commitments; and
 - Intelligence is a force multiplier.
- In this same vein, the staffs have urged us to be innovative in our presentations this year, with the goal of holding the attention of the new members so they will take the time to understand the unique aspects of intelligence which justify the budgetary growth we are requesting. How we do that is question we still don't have all the answers to. I would certainly appreciate any views that you might have on this subject.
- But, before I entertain your questions, let me just say in closing that its going to be a difficult year, more challenging to you, our legislative liaison professionals, than any in the recent past. But I'm confident that you are up to the challenge, and I believe the conference today will help coordinate our activities so we can put our case before the Congress most persuasively.
- I would now be happy to try to answer any questions you might have.

ILLEGIB

ILLEGIB

Handle via TALENT-
KEYHOLE Channels

TOP SECRET